

much more revenue than was guaranteed at planting.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, my amendment would have saved at least \$7.7 billion over the next 10 years, and possibly even much more in years with a severe drought, such as the \$6 billion last year. This amendment was endorsed by the Citizens Against Government Waste, Americans for Tax Reform, the National Taxpayers Union, Heritage Action, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and a slew of other fiscally conservative organizations, as well as the Environmental Working Group.

Professor Bruce Babcock, a professor from Iowa State University who helped invent revenue coverage in the mid-1990s, has said:

Crop insurance is not an insurance program. It's a social program.

And, he says, because of how American agriculture works, it's a social program that helps the biggest agribusinesses the most.

My amendment even got a tacit enforcement from the Farm Bureau because they realized this subsidy has now become too lucrative and too excessive. But the agribusiness lobby was afraid of my amendment and kept it from even being presented on the floor because they were almost certain it would pass.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make changes in the future so too much tax money will not go to Cadillac crop insurance programs.

#### COAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in May, more than 130 employees at PBS Coals in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, were laid off. It was the third round of layoffs by the company in less than a year. The men and women of PBS Coals joined more than 5,000 coal miners who lost their jobs in 2012.

With his announcements of "Cap-and-Trade: The Sequel," the President recently declared not just a war on coal but a war on jobs. It won't just be coal miners who lose their jobs or boilermakers who no longer are building and maintaining power plants, but also thousands of laborers, electricians, operating engineers, steamfitters, welders, plumbers, carpenters, machinists, and railroad workers will be out of work—real people, real faces, real families. They'll join the 130 at a Joy Mining factory in Millersburg, Kentucky, who were laid off in March; in Peoria, Illinois, the hundreds of boilermakers at a Komatsu equipment factory who were let go; and, in Erie, Pennsylvania, where GE is laying off 950 workers at its locomotive plants because less coal means less work for the railroads.

These men and women are out of work because, at the country's 600 coal

plants, more than 20 percent of all coal-fired units are being shut down in part due to EPA regulations. And that was before the President's speech on Tuesday announcing new global warming regulations. Now, more families will be out of work and struggling to get by. These are American families trying to pay off mortgages, car loans, put their children through school. Real Americans who sweated and toiled, all in hopes that the next generation of their children would climb higher towards the American Dream.

The President's new coal regulations will come at a cost of \$184 billion and 180,000 fewer jobs each year in mining, transportation, manufacturing, and power generation. As coal energy is cut off, it means higher electric bills. Families will spend \$400 more each year on their energy bill. That's on top of the \$2,000 more each year they pay for gasoline. And higher energy bills means higher manufacturing costs, hurting our steel industry even more as it struggles to compete in world markets.

We should be modernizing, not shutting down these coal-powered plants. We can burn coal cleanly. Since 1970, coal has tripled in its use. Meanwhile, sulfur dioxide emissions are down 56 percent and nitrous oxide is down 38 percent. Mercury emissions in the U.S. dropped roughly 60 percent since the 1950s.

Let's bring back the campaign promise made by President Obama for clean coal and use the talent of our scientists and engineers and our tradesmen for better technology.

This week, families throughout America were startled when a top Obama science adviser was quoted in The New York Times saying, "A war on coal is exactly what's needed."

But this is not just a war on coal. It's a war on the American worker and their family. These families want high-paying jobs and lower energy bills. They want doors to open, not to have them slam in their faces. They do not want Washington to surrender American jobs to foreign manufacturers. These fathers, these mothers, and these children will not surrender. They are waking up and saying, Stop the war on our jobs. And they are not going to sit back quietly much longer.

#### AMERICAN ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULVANEY. I come before you today to talk a little bit about energy. Later on today, we'll be talking more about the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, part of the Republican Party's all-of-the-above energy program. It's a good opportunity for us to talk about various different things in energy.

I was home, Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago going through one of my manufacturing facilities in my district, and I asked some of the folks who were

working there what we could do here to help create more American manufacturing jobs. And I was struck by the answer. The answer was very clear. They said, Keep our energy costs down.

They also talked about regulation. They also talked about health care. They talked about a lot of the things we hear all over the place. But the first thing that they mentioned to me, which was to keep energy costs down, was very interesting.

I said, Why is it so important? They make rolled rings, they do heavy manufacturing. It's a metal foundry. And they said that not only does lower energy keep their costs of materials down and make them more competitive in the world, but lower energy also keeps their cost of operations down, which makes them more competitive in the rest of the world, and, obviously, kept the cost to their employees down of simply getting back and forth to work.

Low energy costs were the best thing we could do for this heavy manufacturer back in South Carolina. I think that's very instructive to us, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to answering the question of what we're doing for jobs. We're here today to talk about not just energy but about jobs.

One of the big pieces to our all-of-the-above proposal is the Keystone pipeline. Many people have heard about it. I want to talk for a few minutes about it today.

One of the biggest objections the President made to it originally when it came out was environmental; and many people saw this map from Alberta, Canada, down to the Gulf of Mexico, in which the administration very prominently featured that this went through a large aquifer with a name that I cannot pronounce, in all seriousness. The administration wanted to draw attention to the fact that, Oh, my goodness, this pipeline went through this aquifer and it was going to poison the drinking water in all these Midwestern States and wasn't that a terrible thing. This is the map the administration wanted all of us to see.

□ 1110

This is the map of the real world. This is the map that shows where these pipelines already function and function extraordinarily well. There are pipelines all over the central part of this country, all over this aquifer already, without any harm to any person. Aquifers usually are several hundred feet deep and pipelines are 10 or 20 feet deep. We have the ability, we have the know-how, to do this safely and soundly. We've been doing it for over a century in this country. There are no environmental risks to going in this particular location through this particular aquifer. We know how to do it, and we know how to do it well.

Now we hear a new objection, Mr. Speaker. We hear an objection that the administration doesn't want to backslide. I heard an interview today where